

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7, 12-14, and 17-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 19 and 20 are amended by the present amendment.

Amendments to Claims 19 and 20 are supported by the originally filed specification at least at page 4, lines 1-29, and in Figures 1A and 1B. It is believed no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Young; Claims 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Young; Claims 22, 23, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Young in view of Hartigan; and Claims 5, 6, 7, 12-14, 17, and 18 were allowed.

Applicant thanks Examiners Sheng and Chang for the indication of allowable subject matter and for the courtesy of an interview with applicant's representatives on May 27, 2004. During the interview, proposed amendments further distinguishing the claimed invention over references in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. The Examiners agreed that the proposed amendments appear to overcome the references, and indicated that a further search may be required after a response is filed. Arguments and proposed amendments discussed during the interview are reiterated below.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Young and Claims 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Young. Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections.

Amended Claim 19 is directed to a portable electronic apparatus that includes a main body with a display unit on a surface thereof, and a holding unit protruding substantially perpendicular from the main body for holding the portable electronic apparatus and including

a pointing device and switches configured to be operated by a same hand holding the holding unit so that the portable electronic apparatus is held and operated with one hand. In addition, the portable electronic device includes a connector configured to support the main body apart from the holding unit such that a thumb space is provided between the holding unit and the main body. The pointing device is provided in the thumb space and is configured to be operated by a thumb of the same hand. Claim 20 includes similar features.

In a non-limiting embodiment, Figures 1A and 1B show a portable electronic apparatus 1 with a main body 2, a connector 5, and a holding unit 3. The connector 5 is configured to support the main body 2 apart from the holding unit 3 such that a thumb space is provided between the holding unit 3 and the main body 2. The pointing device 10 is provided in the thumb space between the main body 2 and the holding unit 3, and the pointing device 10 is configured to be operated by a thumb F1 of the users hand H.

As discussed during the interview, Young does not appear to teach or suggest a connector configured to support a portable apparatus main body apart from a holding unit such that a thumb space for operating a pointing device is provided between the holding unit and the main body. Young discloses an inside connector 9 that electrically connects a handheld computer (e.g., portable electronic apparatus) to a connector cord 10, which in turn is electrically connected to a handle/controller base unit 2 that has cursor balls 5R and 5L (e.g., pointing device). Thus, the inside connector 9 of Young does not “support the main body” from the holding unit, as in the amended claims. Further, Young does not disclose a thumb space between the base and the computer. Hence, applicant respectfully submits that Young does not teach or suggest “a connector configured to support the main body from the holding unit such that a thumb space is provided between the holding unit and the main body,” as in the amended claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 19 and 20, and claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Young.

Claims 22, 23, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Young in view of Hartigan. Applicant respectfully traverses that rejection.

Claims 22 and 23 depend from Claim 19, and Claims 25 and 26 depend from Claims 20, and as discussed above, Claims 19 and 20 are believed to patentably define over Young. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Hartigan also does not teach or suggest the features of independent Claims 19 and 20.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 19 and 20, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gergory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

GJM:SS:ZSSdnf  
I:\ATTY\ZS\19\S\193236US\193236-AM.052704.DOC